REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the title as not being sufficiently descriptive. We have amended the title to address the Examiner objection.

Prior Art Rejections

Shiraishi et al (U.S. 7,072,257)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5 and 7-15 as being anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) by Shiraishi et al. Applicants respectfully assert that Shiraishi et al is not available as prior art against the claimed invention. In particular, the invention recited in independent claims 1 amd 15 claim priority to JP2003-033889, filed in Japan on February 12, 2003. A certified copy of the priority document was filed concurrently with the present application. A translation of the priority document including a statement of accuracy is enclosed herewith, thereby perfecting the priority claim. A review of the translated specification and figures reveals that the priority document is substantially equivalent to the present disclosure. As a result, the present invention is entitled to the filing date of the priority document, which is February 12, 2003. Shiraishi et al, by contrast, has a U.S. filing date of March 4, 2003 and, thus, is not available as prior art under 35 USC 102(2) against the claimed invention.

We further submit that because claims 2-5 and 7-14 depend from independent claim 1, these dependent claism are patentable for at least the same reason that claim 1 is patentable.

The Examiner also rejected dependent claim 6 as being unpatentable over Shiraishi et al and further considered with Sugiyama et al (US 6,735,159). We believe that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the reason stated above in conjunction with independent claim 1.

Hwang et al (US 5,825,726) considered with Kamatani (US 5,587,981) and Mashimo (US 6,954,709)

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hwang further considered with Kamatani and Mashimo. The Examiner acknowledges that

Hwang et al does not disclose the plurality of address decoders and appropriate selection of such predicated upon format/disc type. The Examiner cites Kamatani and Mashimo as teaching this feature and argues that it would have been obvious to a person of skill in the art to modify Hwang's base system with the teachings of Kamatani and Mashimo "so as to provide the appropriate encoder/decoders and increase the flexibility of the base system." We disagree.

Hwang et al discloses a recording system applicable to various formats such as CD-DA, CD-ROM, CD-I, and CD-DOM/MX. However, the various formats disclosed in Hwang et al all have the same physical address format. Accordingly, in Hwang et al, it is unnecessary to change physical address of a first disc recording medium having a first recording format into that of a second disc recording medium having a second recording format.

Mashimo discloses a signal processing circuits including an encode/decode circuit 34(44), which extracts address information, and an encode/decode circuit 40, which performs error correction processes. However, Mashimo et al does not disclose or suggest the plurality of address decoders including a first address decoder for decoding a reproduction signal of a first disc recording medium and generating disc positional information corresponding to the first disc recording medium, and a second address decoder for decoding a reproduction signal of a second disc recording medium and generating disc positional information corresponding to the second disc recording medium, as recited in claims 1 and 15.

Kamatani discloses an optical disc reading apparatus including an address decoder 28, which receives an output signal from an RF amplifier 22 and generates address information. However, Kamatani does not disclose or suggest the plurality of address decoders including a first address decoder for decoding a reproduction signal of a first disc recording medium and generating disc positional information corresponding to the first disc recording medium, and a second address decoder for decoding a reproduction signal of a second disc recording medium and generating disc positional information corresponding to the second disc recording medium, as recited in claims 1 and 15.

The Examiner also rejected claims 2-5 and 7-13 as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claims 1 and 15 and further in view of the acknowledged prior art/figure 1 of Shiraishi

et al. This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the same reason stated above in conjunction with applicants' arguments regarding Shiraishi in view of Masimo and Kamatani in conjunction with claim 1.

The Examiner also rejected claim 6 as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 5 and further in view of Sugiyama et al (US 6,735,159). This rejection should be withdrawn for least the same reason stated above in conjunction with applicants' arguments regarding Shiraishi in view of Masimo and Kamatani in conjunction with claim 1. In addition, Sugiyama et al does not disclose or suggest the plurality of address decoders recited in claims 1 and 15.

The Examiner also rejected claim 14 as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Ito (US 7,075,873). We submit that this rejection should also be withdrawn for at least the same reason stated above in conjunction with claim 1. In addition, we submit that the Ito patent does not qualify as prior art because the U.S. filing date of **Ito** is February 24, 2003, which is after the filing date (February 12, 2003) of the priority document (JP2003-033889) of the present invention.

Please apply any credits or additional charges to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 19, 2007

Frank R. Occhiuti
Reg. No. 35,306

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906